Amendment dated:March 9, 2006

Reply to Office Action of November 9, 2005

Docket No.: 0505-1267P Art Unit: 3617

Page 8 of 12

REMARKS

The Applicants thank the Examiner for the thorough consideration given the present

application. Claims 1-20 are pending. Claims 7-10 and 17-20 are withdrawn. Claims 1, 6,

11, and 16 are amended. Claims 1 and 11 are independent. The Examiner is respectfully

requested to reconsider the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks set forth

herein.

Reasons for Entry of Amendments

At the outset, it is respectfully requested that this Amendment be entered into the

Official File in view of the fact that the amendments to the claims automatically place the

application in condition for allowance.

In the alternative, if the Examiner does not agree that this application is in condition

for allowance, it is respectfully requested that this Amendment be entered for the purpose of

appeal. This Amendment was not presented at an earlier date in view of the fact that the

Examiner has just now presented new grounds for rejection in this Final Office Action.

Foreign Priority Claim

The Examiner has not acknowledged the Applicants' claim for foreign priority.

Clarification is respectfully requested in the next official communications.

Drawings

The Examiner has not indicated whether or not the drawings have been accepted.

Clarification is respectfully requested in the next official communications.

Amendment dated: March 9, 2006

Reply to Office Action of November 9, 2005

Docket No.: 0505-1267P Art Unit: 3617

Page 9 of 12

Restriction Requirement

The Examiner has withdrawn claims 7-10 and 17-20 and has made the Restriction

Claims 7-10 and 17-20 remain pending. Independent claims 1 and 11 Requirement final.

are believed to be generic. Assuming independent claims 1 and 11 are found to be allowable,

all claims depending therefrom should also be in condition for allowance.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1-6 and 11-16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Bunya et al. (U.S. 6,752,711) in view of Sheikh-Bahaie (U.S. 6,805,000).

These rejections are respectfully traversed.

While not conceding the appropriateness of the Examiner's rejection, but merely to

advance prosecution of the instant application, each of independent claims 1 and 11 has been

amended to recite a combination of elements in a mounting structure of a tire sensing system

including inter alia

wherein a central part of an outer surface of the air pressure sensor is exposed and

faces radially outward toward an interior of the tire, and

wherein a central part of an inner surface of the air pressure sensor is separated by a

space from the wheel in a radially inward direction.

Support for the novel features of independent claims 1 and 11 can be seen, for

example, in FIGS. 2-4 (Species A), FIGS. 7 and 8 (Species B), FIGS. 9(a) and 9(b) (Species

C), and FIGS. 10 (Species D).

Amendment dated: March 9, 2006

Reply to Office Action of November 9, 2005

Docket No.: 0505-1267P

Art Unit: 3617

Page 10 of 12

Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of elements as set forth in each of

independent claims 1 and 11 is not disclosed or made obvious by the prior art of record,

including Bunya et al. and Sheikh-Bahaie.

In contrast to the present invention, Bunya et al. (see FIGS. 2 and 3, for example)

merely disclose a sensor 41 directly mounted to the rim via a nut 57 at the center of the

sensor 41. Thus, Bunya et al. fail to teach a central part of an inner surface of the air

pressure sensor is separated by a space from the wheel in a radially inward direction, as

presently claimed.

In addition in contrast to the present invention, Sheikh-Bahaie (see FIGS. 1-11, for

example) merely discloses sensor 10 pressing directly against the wheel rim 12 or the strap 102

surrounding the wheel rim. Thus Sheikh-Bahaie fails to teach a central part of an inner

surface of the air pressure sensor is separated by a space from the wheel in a radially inward

direction, as presently claimed.

Further, previously cited references Delaporte et al. and Sanchez et al. fail to make for

the deficiencies of Bunya et al. and Sheikh-Bahaie.

At least for the reasons explained above, the Applicants respectfully submit that the

combination of elements as set forth in each of independent claims 1 and 11 is not disclosed

or made obvious by the prior art of record, including Bunya et al., Sheikh-Bahaie, Sanchez et

al., and Delaporte et al.

Accordingly, independent claims 1 and 11 are in condition for allowance. Further, as

discussed above, independent claims 1 and 11 are believed to be generic.

JMS/CTT/jmb

Amendment dated: March 9, 2006

Reply to Office Action of November 9, 2005

Docket No.: 0505-1267P

Art Unit: 3617 Page 11 of 12

The Examiner will note that dependent claims 6 and 16 have been amended to set

forth additional novel features of the present invention, as well as to place them in better

form.

Accordingly, all dependent claims are in condition for allowance due to their

dependency from allowable independent claims, or due to the additional novel features set forth

therein.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-20 of the present application are in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

Since the remaining patents cited by the Examiner have not been utilized to reject

claims, but merely to show the state of the art, no comment need be made with respect thereto.

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or

rendered moot. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the

outstanding Office Action, and that the present application is in condition for allowance.

If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite

prosecution of this application, he is invited to telephone Carl T. Thomsen (Reg. No. 50,786) at

(703) 205-8000.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future

replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for

JMS/CTT/jmb

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

Application No.: 10/774,446 Amendment dated: March 9, 2006 Reply to Office Action of November 9, 2005 Docket No.: 0505-1267P Art Unit: 3617 Page 12 of 12

any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.17, particularly extension of time fees.

Dated: March 9, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

James M. Slattery

Registration No.: 28,380 # 43,368

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

8110 Gatehouse Rd.

Suite 100 East P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

Attorney for Applicant

JMS/CTT/jmb